



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,976	08/02/2000	Cary Lee Bates	ROC920000102	7828

7590 01/14/2004

Gero G McClellan
Thomason Moser & Patterson LLP
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Houston, TX 77056-6582

EXAMINER

DUONG, OANH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/630,976

Applicant(s)

BATES ET AL.

Examiner

Oanh L. Duong

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-18 and 26-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-18 and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claims 31-33 are directed to an invention that lacks unity with the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the invention originally claimed is directed to configuring the browser program with one of the browser settings, which requires use of search **Class 709, subclass 220**. The invention claimed as claims 31-33 is directed to monitoring the launching of the browser and monitoring the time of loading two sets of browser configuration settings. This process requires switching between two sets of browser configuration settings, which requires use of search **Class 709, subclass 224**.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 31-33 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a nonelected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-10 and 12-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2155

3. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-10, 12-16, 18, 26-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gever et al (Gever) (US 6,313,835 B1) in view of Kanno et al (Kanno) (US 6,526,424 B2).

Regarding claims 1 and 10, Gever, teaches providing a different predetermined time-value and determining whether either of the different predetermined time-values is satisfied with respect to a current time (e.g., see col. 14 line 11-col. 15 line 16). Gever does not explicitly teach configuring the browser program as claimed. However, Kanno teaches configuring the browser program with at least one of browser settings corresponding to the satisfied predetermined time-value (e.g., see col. 5 line 66-col. 6 line 12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify browser setting configuration in Gever as taught by Kanno because such configuration would enable the bookmark to be automatically accessed at a predetermined time. This would have improved the bookmark function.

Regarding claims 3 and 12, Gever teaches predetermined time-values are user-defined (e.g., see fig. 8 col. 15 lines 31-32).

Regarding claims 4 and 13, Gever teaches predetermined time-values are a day and time of day (e.g., see fig. 8 col. 15 lines 31-32).

Regarding claims 5 and 14, Gever/Kanno teaches at least one toolbar configuration (Kanno, fig 3),

Regarding claims 6 and 15, Gever teaches the toolbar configuration comprises at least one configuration selected from the group consisting of a standard toolbar, a navigation toolbar, and address toolbar, and a user-defined toolbar (e.g., see figs 5-6).

Regarding claims 7 and 16, Gever/Kanno teaches a setting for at least one previous visited network address accessed by the browser program (bookmark) (Kanno, e.g., see col. 3 lines 1-12).

Regarding claims 9 and 18, Gever/Kanno teaches network addresses are stored as bookmarks (Kanno, e.g., see col. 3 lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 26, Gever teaches a plurality of predetermined time-values and configuring browser when the corresponding predetermined time-value is satisfies by a current time (e.g., see fig. 8 (e.g., see col. 14 line 11-col. 15 line 16). Gever does not explicitly teach browser settings as claimed. However, Kanno teaches a web browser resident in a memory (e.g., fig. 2); a plurality of time-based browser settings and each of plurality of predetermined time-values corresponds to one of the plurality of time-based browser settings (e.g., see col. 6 line 66-col. 6 line 12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify browser settings in Gever as taught by Kanno because such settings would enable the bookmark to be automatically accessed at a predetermined time. This would have enhanced the bookmark function.

Regarding claim 27, Gever/Kanno teaches at least one toolbar configuration (Kanno, fig 3).

Regarding claim 29, Gever/Kanno teaches browser setting specifies a different bookmark file (Kanno, e.g., see col. 3 lines 1-12).

4. Claims 8, 17 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gever in view of Kanno in further view of Huck (US 5,970,230).

Regarding claims 8 and 17, Gever teaches receiving at least one electronic document containing at least one network address (e.g., see col. 8 lines 36-59); Gever does not explicitly teach manipulating information as claimed. However, Huck teaches determining whether the network address within the electronic document is the at least one previously visited network address (e.g., see col. 3 line 37-col. 4 line 14); and if so rendering the electronic document in a manner indicating the network addresses within the document as being visited (e.g., see col. 6 lines 4-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the manipulating information in the combination of teachings of Gever and Kanno as taught by Huck because such manipulation would provide dynamic links back to referring pages. Thus, customized page(s) would highly be provided.

Regarding claim 28, Gever/Huck/Huck discloses a different previously visited network addresses file (Huck, col. 6 lines 28-33).

5. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gever in view of Kanno in further view of Nielsen (US 6,510,461 B1).

Regarding claim 30, the combination of teachings of Gever and Kanno does not explicitly teach browser setting specifies a different homepage network address.

However, Nielsen teaches browser a setting specifies a different homepage network address (e.g., see col. 17 lines 53-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the browser setting specifies the homepage network address in the combination of teachings of Gever and Kanno as taught by Nielsen because such setting would enable the browser to store network addresses in an ordered way, and provide an automatic way to retrieve network addresses from the list at a subsequent visit. Thus, information would have been retrieved conveniently and efficiently (Nielson, col. 3 lines 10-11).

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2155

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh L. Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Out
O.D
January 8, 2004


HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER